

The CHAIRMAN: If the Government have qualified overseers in each district and a general inspector for the province, why should there be any necessity for an advisory board? Could not the inspector and the overseers do as good work or better work than an advisory board?

Mr. IRVING: No. When I speak of an advisory board, I mean a board composed of men who are not subject to political exigencies. I know—it is a well known fact—that political exigencies often cause action to be taken which is not always in the best interests of the industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you are not aware of the fact that we have a Civil Service Commission which takes all the appointments in connection with the fisheries out of the hands of the politicians?

Mr. IRVING: I am relieved to hear that.

The CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get at is the jurisdiction, so to speak, of the Provincial Government, what do they do? Have they a Provincial Minister of Fisheries in British Columbia? What do they do with regard to the fisheries?

Mr. IRVING: They are not acting in an executive capacity with regard to the regulations. They have dropped out of that entirely so far as I know. But they do keep an eye on the business, particularly with regard to taxation. They continue to tax us alright.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not taking an interest in the fisheries. Do they do any real work to conserve the fish supply or to regulate the fisheries? My idea is to try to get information as to whether it is good policy to have Provincial or Federal control.

Mr. IRVING: I do not think that there should be dual control.

The CHAIRMAN: You think it is a national industry?

Mr. IRVING: Undoubtedly.

The CHAIRMAN: Then would you say that Federal control should be the only real control?

Mr. IRVING: Federal control is satisfactory to me, only the business should receive a lot more attention than it has received in the past. Now with regard to the question of an embargo on the export of salmon. I see that that is a question which came before your Committee on a former occasion. That has been reported against very strongly in former years, and particularly in the report of Mr. Evans. On page 37 of Mr. Evans' report it is shown how in 1916, sixteen million odd pounds of salmon were taken from British Columbia waters and exported to the United States.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. How many pounds?—A. 16,051,600.

*By Mr. McQuarrie:*

Q. What year?—A. That is in 1916. "The Canadian canneries submitted a calculation to show that there would have been a net gain to Canada of over half a million dollars if these fish had been canned in this country instead of being exported in a fresh condition; making due allowance for the amount paid the fishermen in excess of the amount the Canadian canners had been prepared to pay." We have sympathy with the fishermen, who find it very hard to make a living, it is a hard, rough life in any case, but I think you will all agree that a man who has put his money into a plant and brought the market right to the door of the fishermen, or right close to the fisherman, is deserving of some consideration, and if foreigners are permitted to come in and take away his raw material so that he has to stand idle, it is detrimental, apart from the actual loss that the country sustains. I have not checked this statement in this report, but I have no reason to doubt that it is about

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]